A no-go theorem for theories that decohere to quantum mechanics

Ciarán M. Lee[1,*] and John H. Selby[2,3,†]

[1]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK*
[2]*University of Oxford, Department of Computer Science, Wolfson Building, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3QD, UK.*
[3]*Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK.*

Quantum theory is the most experimentally verified physical theory in the history of science. Yet it may be the case that quantum theory is only an effective description of the world, in the same way that classical physics is an effective description of the quantum world. In this work we ask whether there can exist an operationally-defined theory superseding quantum theory, but which reduces to quantum theory via a decoherence-like mechanism. We prove that no such post-quantum theory can exist if it is demanded that it satisfies two natural physical principles, *causality* and *purification*. Here, causality formalises the statement that information propagates from present to future, and purification that each state of incomplete information arises in an essentially unique way due to lack of information about an environment system. Hence, our result can either be viewed as a justification of why the fundamental theory of Nature is quantum, or as showing in a rigorous manner that any post-quantum theory must abandon the principle of causality, the principle of purification, or both.

arXiv:1701.07449v1 [quant-ph] 25 Jan 2017

In 1903 Michelson wrote *"The more important fundamental laws and facts of physical science have all been discovered, and these are so firmly established that the possibility of their ever being supplanted in consequence of new discoveries is exceedingly remote"* [Mic03]. Within two years Einstein had proposed the photoelectric effect [Ein05] and within thirty quantum theory was an established field of scientific research. This new science revolutionised our understanding of the physical world and brought with it a litany of classically counter-intuitive features such as superposition, entanglement, and fundamental uncertainty.

Today, quantum theory is the most accurately tested theory of Nature in the history of science. Yet, just as for Michelson, it may turn out to be the case that quantum theory is only an effective description of our world. There may be some more fundamental theory yet to be discovered that is as radical a departure from quantum theory as quantum was from classical. If such a theory exists, there should be some mechanism by which effects of this theory are suppressed, explaining why quantum theory is a good effective description of Nature. This would be analogous to decoherence, which both suppresses quantum effects and gives rise to the classical world [JZK+13, Zur03]. As such, we call such a mechanism *hyperdecoherence* [48].

We formalise such a hyperdecoherence mechanism within a broad framework of operationally-defined physical theories by generalising the key features of quantum to classical decoherence. Using this we prove a no-go result: there is no operationally-defined theory that satisfies two natural physical principles, *causality* and *purification*, and which reduces to quantum theory via a hyperdecoherence mechanism. Here, causality formalises the statement that information propagates from present to future, and purification that each state of incomplete information arises in an essentially unique way due to a lack of information about some larger environment system. In a sense, purification can be thought of as a statement of "objective uncertainty"; any missing information about the state of a given system can always be accounted for by considering it as part of a larger system. Our result can either be viewed as a justification of why the fundamental theory of Nature is quantum, or as highlighting the ways in which any post-quantum theory must radically depart from a quantum description of the world.

I. DECOHERENCE

One of the standard descriptions of the quantum to classical transition is environment-induced decoherence [Zur03]. In this description, a quantum system interacts deterministically with some environment system, after which the environment is discarded, leading to a loss of information. This procedure formalises the idea of a quantum system irretrievably losing information to an environment, leading to an effective classical description of the decohered system. The decoherence process can be viewed as inducing a completely positive trace preserving map on the original quantum system, which is termed the *decoherence map*.

A concrete example serves to illustrate the key features of this map. Consider the following reversible interaction with an environment: $U = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \pi_i$, where $\{|i\rangle\}$ is the computational basis and π_i is a unitary which acts on the environment system as $\pi_i |0\rangle = |i\rangle\,, \forall\ i,$. Switching to the density matrix formalism, the decoherence map arising from the above interaction corresponds to

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}_E\left(U\rho\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|_E U^\dagger\right) = \sum_i \langle i|\,\rho\,|i\rangle\,|i\rangle\langle i|\,,$$

*Electronic address: ciaran.lee@ucl.ac.uk
†Electronic address: john.selby08@ic.ac.uk

where ρ is the input quantum state. Hence, in this concrete setting, $\mathcal{D}$ is a de-phasing map.

It is clear that $\mathcal{D}(\rho)$ will always be diagonal in the $\{|i\rangle\}$ basis, regardless of the input. Hence, as they have no coherences between distinct elements of $\{|i\rangle\}$, the states $\mathcal{D}(\rho)$ correspond to classical probability distributions. In fact, the entirety of classical probability theory—corresponding to probability distributions over classical outcomes, stochastic maps acting on said distributions, and measurements allowing one to read off the probabilities of different possible outcomes—can be seen to arise from quantum theory by applying $\mathcal{D}$ to density matrices ρ as $\mathcal{D}(\rho)$, completely positive trace preserving maps $\mathcal{E}$ as $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{D}(\cdot)\right)\right)$, and POVM elements M as $\mathrm{Tr}\left(M\mathcal{D}(\cdot)\right)$. In this manner, one can consider classical probability theory to be a sub-theory of quantum theory—meaning that applying stochastic maps to probability distributions results in probability distributions—where $\mathcal{D}$ is the map restricting quantum theory to the classical sub-theory.

There are three key features of the decoherence map that we will use to define our hyper-decoherence map in section III:

1. It is trace preserving, corresponding to the fact that it is a deterministic process.

2. It is idempotent, meaning

$$\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{D}(\rho)\right) = \mathcal{D}(\rho), \text{ for all } \rho.$$

   This corresponds to the intuitive fact that classical systems have no more coherence 'to lose'.

3. If $\mathcal{D}(\rho)$ is a pure classical state, i.e. $\mathcal{D}(\rho) = |i\rangle\langle i|$ for some i, then it is clearly also a pure quantum state. This is a consequence of the fact that decoherence arises from an irretrievable loss of information to an environment and if the state that results from this procedure is a state of maximal information, then no information can have been lost to the environment.

II. GENERALISED THEORIES

To begin to make progress on the question raised at the start of this paper, we need to be able to describe theories other than quantum and classical theory in a consistent manner. This calls for a broad framework that can describe any conceivable and well-defined physical theory. The framework we present here is based on [CK16, CDP10, Har11, LB15][49] and takes the view that, ultimately, any physical theory is going to be explored by experiments, and so must have an *operational* description in terms of these experiments. A theory in this framework can therefore be described as a collection of *processes*, each of which corresponds to a particular outcome occurring in a single use of a piece of lab equipment in some experiment. In general, each process has some number of inputs and outputs, and one can intuitively think of *systems* as passing between the input and outputs of a given process. Systems are labelled by different *types* $A, B, \ldots$.

Processes can be connected together to form experiments, for example:



This wiring together of processes must satisfy two conditions: firstly, system types must match, and secondly, no cycles can be created. The relevant data for a particular diagram is just the *connectivity*: which outputs are connected to which inputs and the ordering of the free inputs and outputs. Any diagrams formed in this way must also correspond to a valid process in the theory. One can think of the diagrams formed by connecting different processes as akin to circuits drawn in the field of quantum computation.

Processes with no inputs are known as *states*—corresponding to density matrices in quantum theory—those with no outputs *effects*—corresponding to POVM elements in quantum theory, and those having both inputs and outputs *transformations*—corresponding to completely positive trace non-increasing maps in quantum theory. When the diagram representing the connections of processes in an experiment has no free inputs or outputs, we associate it to the probability that all of these processes occur when the experiment is run, for example:



$$:= \quad \mathbf{Pr}(f, g, h, i)$$

There are then two natural assumptions that we make for theories within this framework. The first is *tomography*: if two processes give the same probabilities in all experiments, then they are the same process. That is:

$$f = g \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \forall X, \ \mathbf{Pr}(f, X) = \mathbf{Pr}(g, X)$$

where X is any diagram which, when composed with f or g, has no free inputs and outputs. The second is *convexity*: given a collection of processes with the same inputs and outputs, it is possible to obtain a process corresponding to a convex combination of these, defined by

$$h = \sum_i p_i f_i \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \forall X, \ \mathbf{Pr}(h, X) = \sum_i p_i \mathbf{Pr}(f_i, X)$$

where p_i defines a probability distribution (i.e. $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\sum_i p_i = 1$). Convexity allows us to define *purity* of

states. A state is pure if it is not a convex combination of other distinct states.

In what follows, we will require our post-quantum theory to satisfy two natural physical principles, *causality* and *purification*, which were first introduced in [CDP10]. A process is *deterministic* if the piece of lab equipment it corresponds to only has one possible outcome.

Causality [CDP10]: For each system of type A, there exists a unique deterministic effect, denoted as

This may seem like a somewhat odd definition for causality, however it can be shown to be equivalent to the statement that future measurement choices do not effect current experiments [CDP10]. It also implies the no superluminal signalling principle [Coe14] and provides a unique definition of marginalisation for multi-system states. A process f is said to be *causal* if



In quantum theory the unique deterministic effect is provided by the (partial) trace and so causal transformations are precisely those that are trace preserving. It can be shown for general theories [CS15b] that both reversible and deterministic transformations are causal.

Purification [CDP10]: For every state on a given system A, there exists a pure bipartite state on some composite system AB, such that the original state arises as a marginalisation of this pure bipartite state:



Here, ψ is said to *purify* ρ. Moreover, any two pure states ψ and ψ' on the same composite system which purify the same state are connected by a reversible transformation



If one considers a pure state to be a state of maximal information, then the purification principle formalises the statement that each state of incomplete information arises in an essentially unique way due to a lack of information about a larger environment system. In a sense, purification can be thought of as a statement of "information conservation"; any missing information about the state of a given system can always be traced back to lack of information of some environment system. Or, more succinctly: information can only be discarded, not destroyed [CS15a].

The purification principle, in conjunction with another natural principles, implies many quantum information processing [CDP10] and computational primitives [LS16b]. Examples include teleportation, no information without disturbance, no-bit commitment [CDP10], and the existence of reversible controlled transformations. Moreover, purification also leads to a well-defined notion of thermodynamics [CS15b, CS16a, CS16b].

III. HYPERDECOHERENCE

In section I, the quantum to classical transition was modelled by a decoherence map restricting quantum systems to classical ones. We can analogously model a post-quantum to quantum transition with a *hyperdecoherence* map, represented diagrammatically by , which restricts post-quantum systems—described by a generalised theory from section II—to quantum ones. We now adapt the three key features of decoherence outlined at the end of section I to this general setting, ending this section with a formal definition of a post-quantum theory.

As in the quantum to classical transition, we think of this hyperdecoherence map as arising via some deterministic interaction with an environment system, after which the environment is discarded by marginalising with the unique deterministic effect. Hence, as with standard decoherence, hyperdecoherence can be thought of as an irretrievable loss of information to an environment. As deterministic processes are causal, the hyperdecoherence map should be causal:



This is the analogue of point 1 from the end of section I.

Moreover, hyperdecohering twice should be the same as hyperdecohering once, as the hyperdecohered system has no more 'post-quantum-coherence' to 'lose'. Hence this map should be idempotent:



This is the analogue of point 2 from the end of section I.

As was the case for classical theory in section I, one can construct the entirety of quantum theory as a sub-theory of the post-quantum theory by appropriately applying to states, transformations, and effects from the post-quantum theory. That is, density matrices, completely positive trace non-increasing maps, and POVM elements correspond to



Hence—as $\boxplus$ is idempotent—quantum states, transformations, and effects are those left invariant by the hyperdecoherence map.

One can define a notion of purity relative to the sub-theory constructed via the above procedure. A state from the sub-theory is *pure in the sub-theory* if it cannot be written as a convex combination of other states *from the sub-theory*. Note that a state which is pure in the sub-theory may not be pure in the full post-quantum theory, as a state that cannot be written as a convex combination of states from the sub-theory may turn out to be decomposable as a convex combination of states lying outside the sub-theory. As hyperdecoherence arises from an irretrievable loss of information to an environment, if a state resulting from this process is a state of maximal information, then no information can have been lost to the environment. We formalise this by demanding that pure states in the sub-theory are pure in the post-quantum theory. This is the analogue of point 3 from the end of section I.

Finally, we say a hyperdecoherence map is *trivial* if it is equal to the identity transformation:



To summarise all of the above, we now formally define a post-quantum theory.

Post-quantum theory: A generalised theory is a post-quantum theory if, for each system type A, there exists a hyperdecoherence map $\boxplus_A$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\boxplus_A$ is causal: 

2. $\boxplus_A$ is idempotent: 

3. Pure states in the sub-theory are pure states.

Moreover, the sub-theory defined by the collection $\left\{\boxplus_A\right\}$ is quantum theory and at least one of the hyperdecoherence maps must be non-trivial.

IV. RESULT

Main Theorem. *There is no post-quantum theory satisfying both causality and purification.*

Proof. We prove that in any post-quantum theory satisfying causality and purification, the hyperdecoherence map must be trivial for all systems. The main idea of the proof is to show that by performing a suitable post-quantum measurement on the quantum Bell state and post-selecting on a suitable post-quantum effect, any post-quantum state can be steered to. As quantum states are left invariant by the hyperdecoherence map (even locally, as we show below), all post-quantum states are left invariant as well—due to the fact that they can be steered to using a quantum state. Hence, for each system, the hyperdecoherence map must be the identity, a contradiction.

For ease of exposition, diagrammatic notation will be used throughout the proof. Note that it can alternatively be written using standard algebraic notation. For convenience we denote quantum states with a subscript q. Given a bipartite quantum state ψ_q, it can be written as



Idempotence of the hyperdecoherence map then gives



(1)

Next, consider the maximally mixed quantum state, $\mu_q := \frac{\mathbb{1}}{d}$, of a d-dimensional system. For any pure quantum state ψ_q, there is a state σ_q such that



(2)

Now, denote the Bell state $\frac{1}{d}\sum_{ij}|ii\rangle\langle jj|$ for a d-dimensional system diagrammatically as:

As the hyperdecoherence map is causal, marginalisation in the post-quantum theory is the same as in quantum theory. Hence, the marginals of the above Bell state are the maximally mixed quantum state



(3)

Eq. (3), in conjunction with the fact that reversible transformations are causal, implies that for any reversible transformation G—including post-quantum transformations—we have



As the marginalised systems are of the same type, the purification principle implies [50] the existence of a reversible transformation T such that



Hence,



(4)

the maximally mixed quantum state is invariant under *all* reversible transformations in the post-quantum theory.

A standard result [CDP10] obtained from purification is *transitivity*: given any two pure states of the same system there exists a reversible transformation between them. This result, in conjunction with eq. (4) and (2), gives



(5)

where ϕ is an arbitrary pure state in the theory. Hence, *any* pure state from the post-quantum theory arises in a decomposition of the quantum maximally mixed state.

Now, as every (non-trivial) quantum system A has at least two perfectly distinguishable states, $\{|0\rangle\langle 0|, |1\rangle\langle 1|\}$, given the decomposition of Eq. (5), *convexity* implies the following is a state in the post-quantum theory:



Consider a purification of this state, denoted $\mathcal{S}_\phi$, and note that it has the following properties:

1. 

2. 

3. 

Where the effect 0_q is the quantum effect $\mathrm{Tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|\,\cdot)$ which gives probability 1 for state 0_q and probability 0 for 1_q. As the product of two pure quantum states is a pure quantum state, the definition of hyperdecoherence implies that the following is another purification of μ_q with the same purifying system AP as $\mathcal{S}_\phi$



where χ_q is a pure quantum state. The purification principle implies that these two purifications are connected by a reversible transformation R_ϕ:



Using point 3 above, it then follows that there is an effect e_ϕ that *steers* the Bell state to ϕ



(6)

This is true for any pure state ϕ in the theory.

Using Eq. (1) and Eq. (6), and noting that the Bell state for a composite system is the composite of the Bell states for the single systems



(7)

we have, for all pure states ψ and all effects η, that



This result, in conjunction with tomography and convexity, implies that, for all systems A,



□

As we know that there exists a post-classical theory which satisfies causality and purification and decoheres to classical theory, i.e. quantum theory, one might wonder at what stage our proof breaks down when analysing this situation. The main reason is that the maximally correlated state in classical probability theory is mixed and so Eq. 6 is no longer valid. Hence, the reason why quantum theory cannot be extended in the manner proposed here is the existence of pure entangled states.

V. DISCUSSION

From the famous theorems of Bell [Bel64] and Kochen & Specker [KS67] to more recent results by Colbeck & Renner [CR11], and Pusey, Barrett & Rudolph [PBR12], no-go theorems have a long history in the foundations of quantum theory. Most previous no-go theorems have been concerned with ruling out certain classes of hidden variable models from some set of natural assumptions. Hidden variables—or their contemporary incarnation as ontological models [HS10]—aim to provide quantum theory with an underlying classical description, where non-classical quantum features arise due to the fact that this description is 'hidden' from us.

Unlike these approaches, our result rules out certain classes of operationally-defined physical theories which can supersede quantum theory, yet reduce to it via a suitable process. To the best of our knowledge, our no-go theorem is the first of its kind. This may seem surprising given that it is an obvious question to ask. However, to even begin posing such questions in a rigorous manner requires a consistent way to define operational theories beyond quantum and classical theory. The mathematical underpinnings of such a framework have only recently been developed and investigated in the field of quantum foundations.

As with all no-go theorems, our result is only as strong as the assumptions which underlie it. We now critically examine each of our assumptions, outlining for each one the sense in which it can be considered 'natural', yet also suggesting ways in which a hypothetical post-quantum theory could violate it and hence escape the conclusion of our theorem.

Our first assumption is purification. As noted in section II, the purification principle provides a way of formalising the natural idea that information can only be discarded [CS15a], and any lack of information about the state of a given system arises in an essentially unique way due to a lack of information about some larger environment system. However, proposals for constructing theories in which information can be fundamentally destroyed have been suggested and investigated [OR09, BSP84, UW95]. Such proposals take their inspiration from the Black Hole Information loss paradox. Our result can therefore be thought of as providing another manner in which the fundamental status of information conservation can be challenged.

Our second assumption is causality. This principle allows one to uniquely define a notion of "past" and "future" for a given process in a diagram, and is equivalent to the statement that future measurement choices do not affect current experimental outcomes. As such, this principle appears to be fundamental to the scientific method. Despite this, recent work has shown how one can relax this principle to arrive at a principle of indefinite causality [OCB12, OC14, CDP16, Har07]. In this case, there may be no matter of fact about whether a given process causally precedes another. The indefinite causal order between two processes has even been shown to be a resource which can be exploited to outperform theories satisfying the causality principle in certain information-theoretic tasks [ACB14, Chi12]. Moreover, it has been suggested that any theory of Quantum Gravity must exhibit indefinite causal order [Har16a, Har16b]. Hence, as in the previous paragraph, our result provides further motivation for discarding the notion of definite causal order in the search for theories superseding quantum theory.

As purification seems to require a unique way to marginalise multipartite states, one might wonder whether one can define a notion of purification without the causality principle. Indeed, recent work [AFNB16] has shown how one can formalise a purification principle in the absence of causality, and forthcoming work of one of the authors discusses a 'time-symmetric' notion of purification satisfied by quantum, classical and hybrid quantum-classical systems [SSCng].

Another assumption in our theorem was the manner in which our hyperdecoherence map—the mechanism by which the post-quantum theory reduces to quantum theory—was formalised. However, it may not be the case that post-quantum physics gives rise to quantum physics via such a mechanism. Indeed, alternate proposals for how some hypothetical post-quantum theory reduces to quantum theory have been proposed [KOSW13]. Despite this, our understanding of the quantum to classical transition in terms of decoherence suggests hyperdecoherence as the natural mechanism by which this should occur. Hence we see this as the least objectionable of the assumptions made in this work.

The last assumption underlying our no-go theorem is the generalised framework itself, introduced in section II. While the operational methodology underlying this framework is part and parcel of the scientific method, it may not be the case that the correct way to formalise this methodology is by asserting that pieces of laboratory equipment can be composed together to result in experiments, as described in section II. Indeed, it may be the case that the standard manner in which elements of a theory are composed together—resulting in other elements—needs to be revised in order to go beyond the quantum formalism. Work in this direction has already begun [Har13].

Our result can either be viewed as demonstrating that the fundamental theory of Nature is quantum mechanical, or as showing in a rigorous manner that any post-quantum theory must radically depart from a quantum description of the world by abandoning the principle of causality, the principle of purification, or both.

Acknowledgements— The authors thank H. Barnum and B. Coecke for useful discussions and D. Browne, M. Hoban, & J. Richens for proof reading a draft of the current paper. They also acknowledge encouragement from J. J. Barry. This work was supported by the EPSRC through the UCL EPSRC Doctoral Prize, the Controlled Quantum Dynamics Centre for Doctoral Training, and

the Oxford Department of Computer Science. This work began while the authors were attending the "Formulating and Finding Higher-order Interference" workshop at the Perimeter Institute. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science.

[ACB14] Mateus Araújo, Fabio Costa, and Časlav Brukner. Computational advantage from quantum-controlled ordering of gates. *Physical review letters*, 113(25):250402, 2014.

[AFNB16] Mateus Araujo, Adrien Feix, Miguel Navascus, and Caslav Brukner. A purification postulate for quantum mechanics with indefinite causal order. *arXiv:1611.08535*, 2016.

[Bel64] John S Bell. On the einstein podolsky rosen paradox, 1964.

[BMU+14] Howard Barnum, PM Markus, Cozmin Ududec, et al. Higher-order interference and single-system postulates characterizing quantum theory. *New Journal of Physics*, 16(12):123029, 2014.

[Bol16] Arkady Bolotin. On the ongoing experiments looking for higher-order interference: What are they really testing? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.06461*, 2016.

[BSP84] Thomas Banks, Leonard Susskind, and Michael E Peskin. Difficulties for the evolution of pure states into mixed states. *Nuclear Physics B*, 244(1):125–134, 1984.

[CDP10] Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo Mauro DAriano, and Paolo Perinotti. Probabilistic theories with purification. *Physical Review A*, 81(6):062348, 2010.

[CDP16] Giulio Chiribella, Giacomo Mauro DAriano, and Paolo Perinotti. Quantum from principles. In *Quantum Theory: Informational Foundations and Foils*, pages 171–221. Springer, 2016.

[Chi12] Giulio Chiribella. Perfect discrimination of no-signalling channels via quantum superposition of causal structures. *Physical Review A*, 86(4):040301, 2012.

[CK16] B Coecke and A Kissinger. Picturing quantum processes. a first course in quantum theory and diagrammatic reasoning, 2016.

[Coe14] Bob Coecke. Terminality implies non-signalling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.3681*, 2014.

[CR11] Roger Colbeck and Renato Renner. No extension of quantum theory can have improved predictive power. *Nature communications*, 2:411, 2011.

[CS15a] Giulio Chiribella and Carlo Maria Scandolo. Conservation of information and the foundations of quantum mechanics. In *EPJ Web of Conferences*, volume 95, page 03003. EDP Sciences, 2015.

[CS15b] Giulio Chiribella and Carlo Maria Scandolo. Entanglement and thermodynamics in general probabilistic theories. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(10):103027, 2015.

[CS16a] Giulio Chiribella and Carlo Maria Scandolo. Entanglement as an axiomatic foundation for statistical mechanics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.04459*, 2016.

[CS16b] Giulio Chiribella and Carlo Maria Scandolo. Purity in microcanonical thermodynamics: a tale of three resource theories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.04460*, 2016.

[CSTng] Bob Coecke, John Selby, and Sean Tull. Two roads to classicality. forthcoming.

[DB09] Borivoje Dakic and Caslav Brukner. Quantum theory and beyond: is entanglement special? *arXiv preprint arXiv:0911.0695*, 2009.

[Ein05] Albert Einstein. The photoelectric effect. *Ann. Phys*, 17(132):4, 1905.

[Har07] Lucien Hardy. Towards quantum gravity: a framework for probabilistic theories with non-fixed causal structure. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 40(12):3081, 2007.

[Har11] Lucien Hardy. Reformulating and reconstructing quantum theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.2066*, 2011.

[Har13] Lucien Hardy. On the theory of composition in physics. In *Computation, Logic, Games, and Quantum Foundations. The Many Facets of Samson Abramsky*, pages 83–106. Springer, 2013.

[Har16a] Lucien Hardy. Operational general relativity: Possibilistic, probabilistic, and quantum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.06940*, 2016.

[Har16b] Lucien Hardy. Reconstructing quantum theory. In *Quantum Theory: Informational Foundations and Foils*, pages 223–248. Springer, 2016.

[Hen15] Joe Henson. Bounding quantum contextuality with lack of third-order interference. *Physical review letters*, 114(22):220403, 2015.

[HS10] Nicholas Harrigan and Robert W Spekkens. Einstein, incompleteness, and the epistemic view of quantum states. *Foundations of Physics*, 40(2):125–157, 2010.

[JZK+13] Erich Joos, H Dieter Zeh, Claus Kiefer, Domenico JW Giulini, Joachim Kupsch, and Ion-Olimpiu Stamatescu. *Decoherence and the appearance of a classical world in quantum theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[KOSW13] Matthias Kleinmann, Tobias J Osborne, Volkher B Scholz, and Albert H Werner. Typical local measurements in generalized probabilistic theories: Emergence of quantum bipartite correlations. *Physical review letters*, 110(4):040403, 2013.

[KS67] Simon Kochen and Ernst P Specker. The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. 1967.

[LB15] Ciarán M Lee and Jonathan Barrett. Computation in generalised probabilisitic theories. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(8):083001, 2015.

[LS16a] Ciarán M Lee and John H Selby. Deriving grover's lower bound from simple physical principles. *New Journal of Physics*, 18(9):093047, 2016.

[LS16b] Ciarán M Lee and John H Selby. Generalised phase kick-back: the structure of computational algorithms from physical principles. *New Journal of Physics*, 18(3):033023, 2016.

[LS17] Ciarán M. Lee and John H. Selby. Higher-order interference in extensions of quantum theory. *Foundations of Physics, Volume 47, Issue 1, pp 89–112*, 2017.

[Mic03] Albert Abraham Michelson. *Light waves and their uses*. University of Chicago Press, 1903.

[Nie13] Gerd Niestegge. Three-slit experiments and quantum nonlocality. *Foundations of Physics*, 43(6):805–812, 2013.

[OC14] Ognyan Oreshkov and Nicolas J Cerf. Operational

quantum theory without predefined time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.3829*, 2014.

[OCB12] Ognyan Oreshkov, Fabio Costa, and Časlav Brukner. Quantum correlations with no causal order. *Nature communications*, 3:1092, 2012.

[OR09] Jonathan Oppenheim and Benni Reznik. Fundamental destruction of information and conservation laws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0902.2361*, 2009.

[PBR12] Matthew F Pusey, Jonathan Barrett, and Terry Rudolph. On the reality of the quantum state. *Nature Physics*, 8(6):475–478, 2012.

[SCng] John Selby and Bob Coecke. Leaks: quantum, classical, intermediate and more. forthcoming.

[Sor94] Rafael D Sorkin. Quantum mechanics as quantum measure theory. *Modern Physics Letters A*, 9(33):3119–3127, 1994.

[SSCng] John Selby, Carlo Maria Scandolo, and Bob Coecke. A classical purification postulate: what separates quantum and classical theory? forthcoming.

[SVS15] Aninda Sinha, Aravind H Vijay, and Urbasi Sinha. On the superposition principle in interference experiments. *Scientific reports*, 5, 2015.

[UBE11] Cozmin Ududec, Howard Barnum, and Joseph Emerson. Three slit experiments and the structure of quantum theory. *Foundations of Physics*, 41(3):396–405, 2011.

[UW95] William G Unruh and Robert M Wald. Evolution laws taking pure states to mixed states in quantum field theory. *Physical Review D*, 52(4):2176, 1995.

[Zur03] Wojciech Hubert Zurek. Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Reviews of modern physics*, 75(3):715, 2003.

[Życ08] Karol Życzkowski. Quartic quantum theory: an extension of the standard quantum mechanics. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 41(35):355302, 2008.

[48] To the best of the authors knowledge, the notion of hyperdecoherence was first discussed in [Życ08] and has commonly been considered as a mechanism to explain why we do not observed post-quantum effects, such as in [DB09], and, in particular, in the context of higher-order interference [Sor94, LS17, LS16a, LS16b, BMU$^+$14, Bol16, Nie13, Hen15, UBE11, SVS15]. The formalisation of the idea of hyperdecoherence presented here is built on work presented in [SCng, CSTng] where quantum to classical decoherence is discussed in terms of 'leaks' in generalised process theories.

[49] To be precise, one can view a theory in this framework as a generalised probabilistic theory [CDP10, Har11] where the standard assumptions of finite dimensionality and closure of the set of states are not made, or as a process theory [CK16] with the added assumptions of tomography and convexity.

[50] Note that applying a reversible transformation to a pure state results in a pure state [CS15b].